

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

With this amendment Claims 4 – 7, 11 – 13, and 20 - 23 are in the application.  
Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Objections to the Drawings**

Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to include the legend “PRIOR ART” as requested in paragraph 4 of the Detailed Action.

Figure 3 has been amended to address the objections made in paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action. For example, the ball described in the specification has been inserted, thereby addressing one of the objections.

The reference letters “X” and “Y” and “P” have been added to existing dimension lines for making clearer certain dimensions that were illustrated in the original drawings. For example, the reference numeral “X” labels the dimension shown in the original drawing and, in conjunction with corresponding amendments to the specification made above, is characterized in the specification and claims as the “clearance,” between the equator region of the ball and the inner surface 17 at a location (the conforming portion of inner surface 17) that lies in a plane “P” that is perpendicular to the central axis 16 and that passes through the centre point 19.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the drawings and believes that the foregoing drawing amendments address or obviate all of the objections. Accordingly, the Examiner’s approval of the above described drawing amendments is respectfully requested.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

In addition to specification changes made to conform the specification to the drawing changes just described, the foregoing specification amendments also correct a couple of typographical errors, and insert a reference number (27) for the ball that has been added to Fig. 3.

The Examiner’s approval is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112**

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the claims resulting in the formal rejections made under Section 112, second paragraph.

Claim 20 is provided here as a substitute for original claim 1. Claim 20 has no conflicting terms such as “generally cup-shape” and “cup-shape portion.”

Moreover, applicant notes that the structure of the bearing housing has been amended to make clearer how the various portions of that housing relate to an inserted ball before and after deformation of the housing. This, applicant believes, removes the need for defining in the claim the previously listed second and third portions of the ball.

Moreover claim 20 has been written to clarify that it is the recited *plane* (such as shown at “P” in Fig. 3) that is perpendicular to the central axis and that contains the centre of curvature of the cup portion. The claimed conforming portion of the inner surface of the bearing housing lies about (is intersected by) that plane.

As explained in the specification, the curvature of the surface that defines the cup 18 lies approximately at the distance R from the centre point, thereby providing the claimed close seating of a ball in the cup portion of the bearing housing. In reply to the Examiner’s objection in this regard, applicant has inserted the term “approximately” into claim 20 and submits that this amendment defines a fit between the cup and ball that indeed includes a small clearance (“second clearance” in the claims). The “first clearance” is also defined in the claim to avoid confusion with the second clearance.

Applicant believes that new claim 20 fully addresses the double inclusion points made by the Examiner. Applicant notes that the language of claim 20 is intended to include the ball solely for the purpose of clearly defining the particular structure of the bearing housing but without requiring the ball as a limitation of that claim. Claim 7, on the other hand, defines a bearing housing that is deformed around a ball thereby defining a bearing. Claim 7 has been amended to address the confusion pointed out by the Examiner.

Finally, applicant notes that the analogous method claim 22 (which replaces now cancelled claim 8) has been written to address all of the rejections under Section 112. Accordingly, applicant believes all of the rejections under 35 USC § 112 may be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections 35 USC 102(b)**

Claim 20 essentially includes the subject matter of now cancelled claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, and in accord with paragraph 9 of the Detailed Action, applicant submits that this claim and the claims depending therefrom are now allowable.

Similarly, claim 22 essentially includes the subject matter of now cancelled claims 9 and 10. Accordingly, and in accord with paragraph 9 of the Detailed Action, applicant submits that this claim and the claims depending therefrom are now allowable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted: Hancock Hughey LLP  
/pwh #31,169/ Patrick W. Hughey  
Registration No. 31,169; Tel. No. (503) 274-5455